

**REMARKS**

Applicants' invention is defined by claims 68-86 and particularly independent amended claims 68 and 73.

The outstanding Office Action contains an indication of allowable subject matter at claims 71, 72, 76, 77, and 80-86.

Claims 68-70, 73-75, 78-79 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as anticipated by Masuzawa (U.S. Patent No.: 5,821,710) while claim 73 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as anticipated by Nishikawa et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 6,252,323). Claims 74, 75 and 79 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 over the '323 reference and the '710 reference.

In response to these rejections, Applicants have further clarified independent claims 68 and 73 by defining a relationship of the first and second field magnet whereby when the rotor rotates in either direction, one of the magnets is displaced in the axial direction of the shaft and is also displaced in a rotational direction while the other field magnet is fixed. The other field magnet is also defined by the claim as being held on the rotating shaft. A similar amendment is made with respect to independent claim 73.

As defined by independent claims 68 and 73, one of the magnets is always fixed and the other one is displaced. From one direction of rotation of the rotor, a first magnet is displaced and a second magnet is fixed. For the opposite direction of rotation, the first magnet is fixed and the second magnet is displaced. However, what is most important is that one of them is fixed and one of them is displaced regardless of the direction of rotation of the rotor.

The previously discussed reference to Masuzawa '710, aside from the features discussed in the Amendment of October 26, 2004, also fails to contain the feature described above and now a part of independent claims 68 and 73.

The '710 reference only allows for one of the rotors (field magnet) to be able to displace and when the rotor rotation direction is changed, the two rotors

(field magnets) are fixed. That is, two rotors become integral and are not physically separated.

According to the present invention, with one rotation direction, one magnet displaces but another field magnet fixes and in another rotation direction one is also fixed and one is also displaced whereas in the reference to Masuzawa, in one rotation direction there is a displacing of one magnet and fixing of another magnet however, in an opposite direction of rotation both the first and second magnets are fixed.

In the present invention, the particular claimed order occurs under high-speed operation or under the regenerative breaking conditions so that torque is not required. The newly cited reference to Nishikawa et al. '323 also fails to show or make obvious the above limitation concerning the relationships of the magnet during rotation of the rotor as is claimed in each of independent claims 68 and 73 from which the remaining claims depend and contain all of the limitations thereof.


Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this application containing claims 68-86 including independent amended claims 68 and 73 be allowed and be passed to issue.

If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket #056207.50470US).

Respectfully submitted,

July 1, 2005

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Vincent J. Sonderdick  
Registration No. 29,004

CROWELL & MORING LLP  
Intellectual Property Group  
P.O. Box 14300  
Washington, DC 20044-4300  
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500  
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844  
VJS:ddd

Enclosure